

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/554,239 | 10/24/2005 | Klaus Ludwig Christmann | W1.2112 PCT-US | 3127 |
| Douglas R Han | 7590 11/26/200 scom | 8 | EXAM | IINER |
| Jones Tullar & Cooper | | | BANH, DAVID H | |
| P O Box 2266 Eads Stations | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| Arlington, VA | 22202 | | 2854 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 11/26/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|---|--|--------|--|--|--|
| | 10/554,239 | CHRISTMANN ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | DAVID BANH | 2854 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | ears on the cover sheet wit | h the correspondence ac | ddress | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of the state of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period well. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 36(a). In no event, however, may a re vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT cause the application to become ABA | CATION. Sply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this of the ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | · | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>31 Oc</u> | ctober 2008. | | | | | |
| 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This | action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar | — ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under E | closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>48,59,62-64,89 and 92</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5)☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>48,59,62-64,89 and 92</u> is/are rejected | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine | r. | | | | | |
| 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>24 October 2005</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign | priority under 35 U.S.C. § | 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of: | | | | | | |
| 1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) Interview S | ummary (PTO-413) | | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s |)/Mail Date | | | | |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/25/2005, 2/28/2007, 9/05/2007. | 5) Notice of In | formal Patent Application —· | | | | |

Art Unit: 2854

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 59, 89 and 90 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claims depend upon cancelled claim 49. In a telephone conference, it was agreed upon that the claims were intended to depend upon independent claim 48 and will be examined as such. Appropriate correction is required.

Election/Restrictions

2. Claims 50-58, 60, 61, 65-88, 90 and 91 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected group, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on October 31, 2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 48, 59 and 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Michalik et al. (US Patent 5,503,379) in view of Hansen (US Patent 5,622,113).

 Michalik et al. teaches a folding apparatus (see Figure 1, the invention in general) for a web fed rotary printing press (column 3, lines 20-25), the folding apparatus adapted to fold a web printed in the printing press (column 3, lines 20-25). Michalik et al. teaches a transport cylinder 9 with at least seven web sections, a folding jaw cylinder 11 and a cutting cylinder 8. Michalik et al.

Application/Control Number: 10/554,239

Art Unit: 2854

does not teach a printing unit adapted to print at least six axially arranged side-by-side pages on a web passing through the printing unit and that the cutting cylinder has at least four cutters working with the transport cylinder being arranged one behind another. However, Hansen teaches a printing unit for printing at least six pages on a web passing through the printing unit (column 1, lines 22-30). Additionally, Hansen teaches a cutting cylinder 12 comprising at least four cutters 18 (see Figure 1) arranged on the cutting cylinder. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a printing unit for printing a web with at least six axially arranged side-by-side pages in order to produce material for folding quickly and to provide four cutters on a cutting cylinder so that the cylinder can cut four times per revolution and thus will be able to revolve slower and more safely while producing the same amount of work.

For claim 59: Michalik et al. teaches that the transport cylinder, cutting cylinder and folding jaw cylinders may be driven by a common single motor (column 3, lines 50-52).

For claim 89: Hansen teaches in its cutting cylinder 12 that the cutters 18 are spaced equally apart, and thus at exactly 90 degrees from one another.

5. Claims 62-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Michalik et al. (US Patent 5,503,379) and Hansen (US Patent 5,622,113) as applied to claim 59 above, and further in view of Stein et al. (US Patent 5,676,056).

The combination of Michalik et al. and Hansen teaches all of the limitations of claim 62 and 63 as found in claim 59 above. The combination does not teach where the drive motor can be disposed. However, Stein et al. teaches that drive motors can be disposed on any cylinder (column 3, lines 45-55). Thus, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to provide the drive on either the cutting cylinder or the transport cylinder to allow it to drive the three cylinders.

The combination of Michalik et al. and Hansen teaches all of the limitations of claim 64 as found in claim 59 above. The combination does not teach a geared drive between the drive motor and the cylinders. However, Stein et al. teaches the use of geared drives to connect the cylinders of a folding apparatus (column 3, lines 45-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use geared drives to connect the drive motor to the three cylinders taught by the combination of Michalik et al. and Hansen for the purpose of allowing a single drive motor to efficiently drive all three cylinders.

Claim 92 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Michalik et al. 6. (US Patent 5,503,379) and Hansen (US Patent 5,622,113) as applied to claim 48 above, and further in view of Inoue (US Patent 4,158,417).

The combination of Michalik et al. and Hansen teaches all of the limitations of claim 92 as found in parent claim 48 above. The combination does not teach that the cutting cylinder acts with the transport cylinder as a thrust element. However, Inoue teaches the cutting cylinder as a thrust element. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the cutting cylinder as a thrust element for severing the web and partitioning it.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID BANH whose telephone number is (571)270-3851. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 9:30AM-8PM.

Application/Control Number: 10/554,239 Page 5

Art Unit: 2854

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on (571)272-2258. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DHB

November 21, 2008

/Daniel J. Colilla/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 2854